



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM.

XXXVI 2.

1. Pp. 161-74. F. Reuss. King Arybbas of Epirus. An investigation of the obscurer historical facts of the time of Demosthenes.

2. Pp. 175-7. I. Stich. In Marci Antonini Commentarios. Critical notes based on a recent examination of Italian manuscripts.

3. Pp. 178-95. L. C. M. Aubert. Adnotationes in Senecae Dialogum I. Critical and explanatory.

4. Pp. 196-205. A. Ludwig. Notes on the Birds of Aristophanes. In the much discussed verse 492, L. points out very convincingly that much of the point must lie in the word *νύκτωρ*: there must be a contrast intended between the artisans who obey the seasonable crowing of the cock (*όπόταν νόμον όρθριον άσση*) and those who start out in the night when the cock crows too early. Euelpides then breaks in with an example of what may happen to these latter unfortunates. In accordance with this view L. proposes to write *άποδεξάμενοι* for *ύποδησάμενοι* in 492. But it is hard to see that his explanation, which seems clearly right, applies any better to the changed text than to that of the MSS. Why may we not understand: *οι δέ βαδίζονσ' ύποδησάμενοι νύκτωρ όπόταν άσση*? There is a loss of a comic touch in giving up the picture of the man who puts on his boots at midnight. In 525, L. writes *καί τοις ιεροίς* instead of *κάν τοις ιεροίς*, a very neat correction.

5. Pp. 206-14. A. Riese. Geographica. Three notes. I. The traditional notion that the Chalybes were the inventors of the use of iron can be traced back to Pliny (H. N. 7, 197), who tells us, after quoting other views, that *alii* ascribed this invention to the Chalybes. Who were these *alii*? Seemingly they were careless readers of Callimachus (Fr. 35 Schneider). Catullus (56, 48 ff.) translates Callimachus as follows: *Iuppiter, ut Chalybon omne genus pereat ET qui principio sub terra quaerere venas institit ac ferri fingere duritiem*. And Catullus had not misunderstood his original: the fragment of Callimachus must be written: *Χαλύβων ως άπόλοιτο γένος γειόθεν άντέλλον τε κακόν φυτόν οι πριν έφηναν*. There is *no* authority for the ascription of the invention of the use of iron to the Chalybes. II. The modern word *gorilla* is due to a slip of the pen in the hand of some ancient copyist. We read in the Periplus of Hanno (118), of an island on the west coast of Africa: *νήσος ήν μεστή ανθρώπων άγρίων. πολλν δέ πλείους ήσαν γυναικες δασείαι τοις σώμασιν, ως οι έρμηνέες εκάλουν Γορίλλας*. Pliny (H. N. 6, 199), who is demonstrably following Hanno, calls these women *Gorgades*. The *έρμηνέες* elsewhere were careful to use names of Greek formation. The conclusion is almost irresistible that the name *Gorgades* in Pliny is taken from a correct text of Hanno. III. In the fourth century B. C. (Ephoros, Skylax) the names *Σαυρομάται* and *Συρμάται* (*Σαρμάται*)

designated distinct peoples on opposite sides of the Tanais. Later Greeks confused these two peoples and used, in the main, the name *Σαυρομάται*. The Romans, on the other hand, generally used the form *Sarmatae*.

6. Pp. 215-26. M. Schanz. Critical notes on the Tract *περὶ πόρων*. S. neither affirms nor denies the authorship of Xenophon. This question can be settled when we have an investigation of the facts of Xenophon's life after the manner of Wilamowitz's paper on Thucydides. S. attempts to show from the collations of Wilamowitz published by Zurborg, that the recension of the text must rest solely on the MSS Vaticanus 1950 and Marcianus 511. He remarks severely on the carelessness with which Zurborg has used the labors of earlier critics. In I 1, S. writes *καὶ τῷ δὲ ὑπόπτους τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν εἶναι*. He points out the fact that there are very many passages in other authors where *ἄν* has taken the place of *δὲ*. So Plat. Lach. 199 C should be written *ἡρωτῶμεν ὅλην δὲ ἀνδρείαν ὅτι εἶη*. Plat. Symp. 222 A, *διοικομένους δὲ ἰδὼν δὴ τις*. And Dem. I 15, *οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐπὶ πολλῶ φανώμεν*. I 7, S. writes *πολλὰ δέχεται ἐμπορία*. IV 13, *τὰ δὲ παροιχόμενα πάντες κατὰ ταῦτ' αὐτὸν ἀκούομεν*. IV 19, *παρὰ τοῦ δημοσίου ἢ παρὰ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν*. IV 34, *μηδὲ οὐτοὶ ἀθυμοῦντων*. IV 39, *κὰν τούτου τοῦ φόβου ἀπηλλαγμένοι εἴημεν*. A similar correction is still needed in Plat. Charm. 174 E, where *ἢ κὰν ὑγιαίνειν ποιοῖ* must be written.

7. Pp. 227-34. K. Hartfelder. The Criticism of Religious Belief in Sextus Empiricus adv. Math. IX 1-194. A careful argument in support of the usual view that Sextus Empiricus followed Kleitomachos (Karneades) in this discussion.

8. Pp. 235-44. F. Bücheler. Old Latin. The Annals of the German Archaeological Institute at Bonn for 1880 contain an elaborate description, with commentary, by H. Dressel, of a triple jar discovered by him in the old burial-ground of the Quirinal. This jar bears the following inscriptions, the writing running from right to left: *Iove Sat deivos goi med mitat, nei ted endo cosmis virco sied asted, noisi Ope Toitesiai paccari vois*, and: *Dvenos med feced en manom einom dze noine med mano statod*. In the latter the name *Dvenos* seems to have been added after the rest was finished. B. translates: "Whoso sends me to the gods Juppiter and Saturn, thee shall no virgin accompany nor stand near thee, unless thou wishest an offering of prayer to be brought to *Ops Toitesia*, and: Bennis made me for a departed soul and so shalt thou offer me on the ninth day to the departed soul. With a crowded conciseness which would permit no report short of a full translation B. discusses the grammatical questions suggested by those inscriptions. He fixes the date at the beginning of the fifth century of the Roman reckoning. He also raises the question whether (leaving out the name *Dvenos*) we have here somewhat awkward and defective Saturnian verse.¹

9. Pp. 245-59. A. Philippi. Notes on the First Five Books of Thucydides. I 7, *ἐφθειρον γὰρ ἀλλήλους* (Herwerden) is a necessary correction, see I 24 and III 92. I 14, it is impossible that Thuc. can have written *ἐτι καὶ πλοίοις μακροῖς*. At least *μακροῖς* must be stricken out, perhaps also *πλοίοις*. The proof lies in the exactness with which Thuc. uses technical terms, in particular the terms *ναῦς* and *πλοῖον*. Good definitions are given by the scholiast to Av. Eq. 1366.

¹ See Amer. Jour. of Phil. III 107, IV 117.

I 18, the words ἐς τὰς ναῦς ἐσβάντες are a *glossema*. I 19, the last sentence can only be understood to apply to the Athenians and their allies. I 55, τῶν Κορινθίων (after τῷ πολέμῳ) must be stricken out as a matter of grammar as well as of historical truth. II 22, Πολυμήδης καὶ Ἀριστόνους, ἀρχηγὸς τῆς στάσεως ἐκότερος, cf. Xen. Hell. 5, 2, 25. II 41, μόνῃ οὔτε τῷ ἐπελθόντι ἀγανάκτησιν ἔχει—πολεμῶ before ἐπελθόντι being an interpolation, see Classen on II 36. III 26, δύο καὶ before τεσσαράκοντα must be given up, see chapters 16, 29, 69, 76. III 82, ὥς ἂν ἐκάστοις αἱ μεταβολαὶ τῶν ξυντυχῶν. IV 67 ff., an interesting note on the text, the topography, the military operations; but without very distinct results. IV, 102, ὅτι περιρρέοντος τοῦ Στρυμόνος, leaving out ἐπ' ἀμφότερα. V 27, ὁλίγους αὐτοκράτορας: that is to say, ἀρχὴν is a gloss on αὐτοκράτορας. V 60, ἐν Νεμέῃ after ἕως ἔτι ἦν ἀθρόον must be stricken out. V 80, τοῦ φρουρίου is a gloss on ἐξω ποιήσας. There is still more in this article which will bear reading by the student of Thucydides.

10. Pp. 260-301. W. Hoerschelmann. Investigations touching the History of the Greek Metrical Writers. An examination of the sources of the scholia to Hephaestion.

11. Pp. 302-28. 'Miscellany. L. Mendelssohn gives a number of "Trifles." Babrius 75, 6, τὴν αὐριον γάρ, τλήμον, οὐχ ὑπερβήσῃ. Chariton, VII 5, 11, ὀλίγον τε ἐπενδύον οὐδέν. Polyaen. I 1, 2, ἐνταῦθα πηγαὶ πολλαί, ἰδαί πυκναί. Caes. Bell. Civ. I 22, 5, ut tribunus plebis nefarie ex civitate expulsos. Cic. de Leg. II 5, 11, esse laudabilem quidam talibus argumentis docent. Val. Max. I 1, 14, quamque merito sibi infestos dominos. Vell. Paterc. II 17, 3, consulatum paene omnium civium suffragiis nactus est.

A. Ludwich remarks on the metrical characteristics of the Gigantomachia of the Greek poet Klaudianos, and proposes several corrections of the text.

H. Luckenbach, after an examination of the original stone at Verona, gives an exacter text of the epigram, Kaibel, 128.

G. Teichmüller discusses ἐπαγωγή, ἐπαγωγή and ἐπαναφέρειν, ἐπιφέρειν. Plato uses the compounds with two prepositions, Aristotle with only one. In Plato the words have hardly become technical; in Aristotle they are fully so. Aristotle uses the two prepositions in familiar words, but in strictly scientific terms not grown popular he prefers to cast away useless elements.

E. Hiller has examined the MSS of Schol. Av. Ran. 218, and shows that the only authoritative text is that given in Cod. Venetus 474.

J. Sommerbrodt describes the Florentine MS (Laur. 77) of Lucian. It is a mixture of leaves written at different times by different hands and of very unequal value.

H. Flach writes of the Lives of Roman Authors in Suidas. It appears that these authors either had written or were believed to have written in Greek. The source of the notices was probably the preface to Capito's translation of Eutropius.

O. Ribbeck calls attention to the expressions in Liv. V 21, which suggest that the historian in his account of the taking of Veii is only giving a paraphrase of a *fabula praetextata*.

A. Biese defends *velatum*, Catull. 64, 64. He finds an echo of Catullus in Ovid, Ars. Am. I 525 ff. There (v. 529) we read *tunica velata recincta*. Further,

Catullus himself, at v. 265 of the same poem, seems to recur to the expression of 64.

A. Stachelscheid gives a collation of the notes in Bentley's copy of Macrobius in the British Museum.

A. Mau argues briefly that neither Ruggiero nor v. Duhn has succeeded in proving anything new about the old course of the river or the situation of the docks at Pompeii.

XXXVI 3.

I. Pp. 329-42. F. Bücheler. Coniectanea. Nine notes. I. Poeta ignotus. In the inscription CIL VI 7574, in the dialogue between Hadrian and Epictetus, published by Fabricius (Bibl. Gr. XIII, p. 561), and in the Gesta Romanorum, cap. 36, are found the materials of a distich composed not much later than the time of the Antonines, which may be thus restored: *mala ut in arboribus pendēt, sic corpora nostra aut matura cadunt aut cito acerba ruunt*. A little further on in the same dialogue between Hadrian and Epictetus occur the words: *nuda Venus picta, nudi pinguntur Amores: quibus nuda placet, nudos dimittat oportet*. This is verse, but it is not quite certain how many of the slips may be due to the author. Perhaps something like this may be restored: *nuda Venus, nudi pueri pinguntur Amores: exhibit nudus cui dea nuda placet*.—II. Victor grammaticus. The grammarian referred to by Priscian (I 19) and Rufinus Antiochensis (Gram. Lat. ed. Keil, VI, p. 573, 26) seems to be identical with the man so neatly praised in Anth. Pal. IX 711: *αὐτὴν γραμματικὴν ὁ ζωγράφος ἤθελε γράφαι, Βίκτορα δὲ γράψας, "τὸν σκοπόν," εἶπεν, "ἔχω"*.—III. The Crispus addressed in Anth. Plan. App. IV 40 is identical with the man addressed by Horace, Od. II 2. In the words *τρισσαὶ Τύχαι* there is a local allusion. Vitruvius (III 2, 2) designates the region of the Horti Sallustiani by the words *ad tres Fortunas*. The sentence *τί γὰρ ἀνδρὶ τοσῶδε ἀρκέσει εἰς ἑτάρων μυσίων εὐφροσύνην*, B. translates: *quae huic satis erit infinitas ad iuvandos amicos?*—IV. *Εὐκλῆς*. An Oscan inscription found near Agnone gives the names of the divinities to whom the altars and statues in the sacred enclosure of Ceres are consecrated as follows (the names being in the dative case): *Vezkei, Evkloi, Kerri*. The second name corresponds naturally to the Greek *Εὐκλῆς* (*Εὐκλος*). Hesychius has this gloss: *εὐκλῆς · ὁ ἀδὴς καὶ ὀνομαστὸς καὶ ἐνευδής*, in which there is nothing wrong but an accent. Further, Fiorelli has recently published (Notizie degli Scavi, 1880, April, p. 155) the inscriptions upon certain gold plates found in the tombs at Sybaris. One of these inscriptions has the lines:

*ἐρχομαι ἐκ καθαρῶν καθαρὰ, χθονίων βασιλεία,
Εὐκλῆς Εὐβουλείς τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἅλλοι,
καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὑμῶν γένος, ὄλβιοι, εὐχομαι εἶναι.*

The form *Evkloi* is to be translated into Latin *Orco*.—V. Ennius et Gniphio. M. Antonius Gniphio, the teacher of Julius Caesar, was the author of a commentary on the Annals of Ennius.—VI. Explanatory notes on the anonymous poem addressed to C. Calpurnius Piso.—VII. Propert. V 11, 72, B. proposes to write *libera fama iugum*.—VIII. Antipatri Tyrii. Fiorelli has published (Notizie degli Scavi, 1880, July, p. 250) the inscription upon the tomb of *Philon Antas Antipatri Tyrii filius*, who was buried at Brundisium. There is reason for

thinking this Philo the son of that Antipater Tyrius who held the first rank among Stoic philosophers in Cicero's time. That Philo was a merchant and a traveller may be inferred from an existing epigram (Kaibel, 779), found upon a votive tablet near Constantinople, in which the sentence ὡδε τὸν ἐνάντητον ἀεὶ θεὸν 'Αντιπάτρον παῖς στήσε Φίλων seems to contain a word-play upon the name Antas. The whole epigram is well written. Further, the man known always to Cicero by the name Antipater Sidonius was a facile versifier and a Stoic not without learning in philosophy. And we learn from a direct statement of Meleager (Anth. Pal. VII 428, 14) that he was born at Tyre. In spite of the commonness of the name Antipater, it seems safe to infer that this earlier Antipater was of the same stock from which the distinguished philosopher and the poetical merchant descended.—IX. Anglosaxonum Latina aenigmata.

2. Pp. 343-50. H. Diels. Stobaeus and Aëtius. Remarks on various matters treated in the *Doxographi Graeci*, for which Elter's dissertation (De Ioannis Stobaei Codice Photiano, Bonn, 1880) affords new points of view.

3. Pp. 351-61. L. Jeep. The Lacunae in the Chronicle of Malalas.

4. Pp. 362-79. M. Schanz. The Writings of Cornelius Celsus. An attempt to find out precisely what may be *known* of the subject, apart from uncertain conjectures. The several paragraphs of the paper may be summarized as follows: 1. The treatise on medicine must have been written later than B. C. 23. This is proved by an allusion to the cure of Augustus by cold water under the treatment of Antonius Musa (Cels. 3, 9). It must have been written earlier than A. D. 48, because Celsus (4, 7) says *quamvis in monumentis medicorum non legerim* of a recipe found in the work of Scribonius Largus, who published his collection not later than A. D. 48. 2. Graecinus, the father of Agricola, wrote a book on the care of vineyards, in which he followed Celsus (Plin. H. U. 14, 33). Graecinus died A. D. 38. Therefore, the *De Re Rustica* of Celsus was published before A. D. 38. 3. The *De Re Rustica* was written earlier than *De Medicina*, as appears from references made in the later treatise. These two works were published together in the order of composition. The inference to this effect from the headings in the MSS is supported by the fact that the opening words of the *De Medicina*, *ut alimenta sanis corporibus agricultura, sic sanitatem aegris medicina promittit*, show the author's usual formula for transition from one subject to another. 4. It is certain that Celsus wrote upon agriculture, medicine, the art of war, rhetoric, and philosophy, and almost certain that he wrote upon law. 5. It is probable that Celsus wrote only one work on philosophy. The statements of Quintilian (X 1, 124; XII 11, 24) support no other inference; and Augustine, in the preface to his *De Haeresibus*, speaks in a way to make it plain that the Celsus whom he mentions wrote of heresies of later origin than the Christian religion. 6. The *De Medicina* suffices to prove the author's habit of referring to his own previous work. But it contains no references to any of the author's *Artes* except the *De Re Rustica*. It follows that the others were published later. The arrangement of the six *Artes* was probably this: *De Re Rustica*, *De Medicina*, *De Re Militari*, *De Rhetorica*, *De Philosophia*, *De Iure Civili*. 7. The title was *Artes*, in spite of the scholion published by Ritschl (Praef. ad Plaut. Bacch. VI). 8. The *De Philosophia* followed the teaching of the Sextii. It is therefore impossible (Sen. Quaest. Nat. 7, 32, 2) to set its date much later than the death of Tiberius (A. D. 37). Connecting

this date with those previously given, we may say that the encyclopaedia of Celsus was published not much later than the death of Tiberius. 9. It is certain that the monograph on War with the Parthians was not written before A. D. 63, and at least possible that it was written by Marius Celsus, a Roman general who took part in the Parthian war in the year 63. 10. Columella mentions Celsus as a man of the past (3, 17, 4; 2, 2, 14), and Seneca as a man of the present (3, 3, 3). Therefore Celsus must have died before Seneca (A. D. 65).

5. Pp. 380-434. E. Rohde. Studies in the Chronology of Greek Literature. The first instalment—for no more is given in this number—discusses the various reasonings and computations which guided Greek chronologers in fixing the date of Homer.

6. Pp. 435-62. F. Hettner. The Discoveries at Neumagen, with a plate of illustrations. In the course of certain excavations at Neumagen on the Mosel, in the year 1878, very extensive remains of Roman sepulchres were brought to light—stones which had been removed from their original places and built into the foundations of mediaeval structures. The inscriptions and sculptures on these stones, and the remains of decorative color as well, are remarkably fresh and well preserved, but the restoration of the original architectural forms is difficult. H. attempts only a preliminary account of the monuments, not a final and complete description. The scenes represented in the sculptures are taken from common life, and show a great variety of occupations, utensils, forms of dress, and the like, in gratifying detail.

7. Pp. 463-80. Miscellany. W. Dittenberger gives a corrected restoration of a metrical inscription published in the Bull. de Corr. Hell. 1880, p. 130, as follows:

Ἀγαθῇ τ[ύχη]
Ἡρωδιανὸς Νει(κί)ου πα(τ)ρὸς (σ)τῆσεν
Χάλκειον ἀνδριάντα πατρίδος ψήφῳ,
γνώμης τε ἑκατι, μείλιχος γὰρ ἦν πᾶσιν,
τερπνῶν τε με(ί)μων οὖς ἐγραψεν ἀστείως.

He adds, by way of joke, this note of the original editor: "celle-ci paraît écrite en trimètres iambiques; mais la règle fondamentale de ce mètre est violée à chaque vers, puisqu' on y trouve régulièrement un spondée ou un trochée au sixième pied."

F. Bücheler repeats an epitaph on another author of Mimes from the Revue Archéologique, 1881, p. 124.

W. Hoerschelmann gives a note on the commentary to the *ἐγχειρίδιον* of Hephaestion. He there finds Alcaeus Fr. 5 in this form: *χαῖρε κυλλάνας ὁ μέδων, σὲ γάρ μοι θυμὸς ὑμνεῖν, τὸν κορυφᾶσιν ἀνγαῖς μαία γέννα τῷ κρονίδῃ μαυία παυβασίλῃ.*

A. Ludwich gives critical notes on the Bibliotheca of Apollodorus.

H. Heydemann contributes several remarks on the interpretation of inscriptions on Greek vases.

A. Philippi objects to Büdinger's method (Berichte d. Wiener Akad. 92, 197 ff.) in trying to restore the story of Solon and Croesus to its old place in history.

A. Riese compares Anth. Lat. 901 with Serv. ad. Verg. Aen. VI 724 by way of showing that the former was not the production of a scholar of the Renaissance.

G. Voigt has collected a number of notices which warrant the hope that material for the restoration of the text of Cicero's letters *ad Familiares* may be found in France.

M. Voigt writes *aprici mergi* for *apris mergis* in the second glossary of Salerno. The explanation would then be intended for Verg. Aen. V 128.

F. Bücheler writes of Petronius at the Hanoverian court in the year 1702. Leibnitz, in a letter to Princess Louise of Hohenzollern, dated at Hanover, 25 Feb. 1702, gave a minute description of the amusements of the carnival, which closed with a burlesque somewhat freely imitated from Petronius. The note with which B. concludes will not seem to readers of this Journal too long for reproduction here. It is as follows: "Wenn dem geehrten Leser diese Mittheilung aus vergangenen Zeiten angenehm oder nützlich scheint, so möge er zugleich erfahren, dass die Anregung dazu von einem Manne kam, den Belesenheit, Geist und Geschmack zu einem Urtheil über philologische Fragen wie kaum einen anderen befähigten, der abgesehen von dem Ehrenplatz, den er in der Geschichte unsrer Wissenschaft behaupten wird, um diese Zeitschrift besonders grosse Verdienste sich erworben hat, nicht allein durch die in derselben gedruckten Beiträge, gehaltreiche eindringliche anziehende Abhandlungen vornehmlich aus früheren Jahren, und feine treffende Monita die er gerne ohne seinen Namen ausgehen liess, sondern durch seine hervorragende Betheiligung an der Redaction, von der auch der Titel mehrerer Bände des Museums Zeugniß ablegt, mit und neben Ritschl und Welcker, und durch seine stete Fürsorge für das wissenschaftliche Gedeihen des von ihm miterzogenen Kindes, die sich bis in seine letzten Tage durch wohl bedachte Rathschläge und wohlwollende Censur zu erkennen gab. Jacob Bernays starb am 26 Mai [1881], keine sechzig alt, ganz unerwartet, wenn auch zwischen Leben und Tod mehrere Tage der Bewusstlosigkeit und Auflösung lagen, kaum hatte er für seinen 'Phokion,' mit dem er eben die Freunde beschenkt, noch ein Wort des Danks entgegen nehmen können. Nicht mit allen Wegen und Mitteln der heutigen Philologie war er einverstanden, von den letzten Decennien lenkte er den Blick lieber zurück zu der ersten Hälfte dieses Jahrhunderts, zu Herren wie Scaliger und Casaubonus, seine Aeusserungen über die junge Sprachwissenschaft und einige andere Theile des Gebiets das uns beiden angelegen war und das er in peripatetischen Gesprächen zu behandeln liebte, entsprachen nicht den jetzt giltigen oder meinen Anschauungen; aber ein grosser Kenner und ein Kenner des Grossen, getränkt aus den edelsten Quellen des Alterthums, bewandert in der Literatur moderner Völker, gewaltig unter den Mitforschenden und ein würdevoller Tyrann der 'Mitredenden' von sehr weitem und sehr scharfem Blick, weise und gerecht und frei von vielen Banden, mit welchen äusseres Leben oder eigene Gelüste bestricken und das Urtheil der Machthaber auch in wissenschaftlichen Dingen gefangen nehmen, wog dieser Eine mehr als Hunderte. οἱκοι μένειν δεῖ τὸν καλῶς εὐδαίμονα pflegte er zu citiren. Haus und Universität waren ihm Eins fast ihm strengsten Wortsinne, das Weichbild Bonns hatte er seit 10 Jahren nicht verlassen (letztmals zu einem Besuch von Johannes Brandis in dessen nahe gelegener Villa am Rhein); der Einsamkeit

ergeben, las und bedachte er unendlich viel, sinnend und rathend über Politik und Judenthum, Philosophie und gelehrte Welt, den Geist spannend ohne Nachlass bis das Hirn tödtlich geschlagen ward. Ein gut Theil seiner Oikonomia betraf dies Museum, so stehe denn hier auch dies Gedenkzeichen für ihn in Dankbarkeit und Wehmuth gesetzt von einem Schüler, Collegen und Freunde."

XXXVI 4.

1. Pp. 481-9. H. Osthoff. Notes on the Inscription of Dvenos (see R. M. XXXVI 235). O. regards *Iove Sat deivos* as accusatives of the *end of motion*. The following words he writes *neited endo cosmis vir cosied asted*. He then translates: "Whosoever shall offer me to the gods Jupiter and Saturn, let him take pains that a helpful man be with him and by him within, unless he wishes the offering of prayer to be brought to Ops Toitesia." It is not safe to identify *cosmis* with *cōmes*; rather we have here a confirmation of the view which connects *cōmis* with *commodus*. The form *vois* (*vis*) cannot be derived from the root *vel*: a parallel root *vi*, to which other indications point, must be assumed.

2. Pp. 490-505. P. Egenolff. In Herodianum Technicum Critica. A continuation of the collations begun in the previous volume (XXXV 98 ff. and 564 ff.)

3. Pp. 506-23. P. Corssen. The Sources of Cic. Tusc. I. In his dissertation *De Posidonio Rhodio* (Bonn, 1878), C. attempted to show that Cicero in the first part of Tusc. I followed his contemporary Posidonius of Rhodes. He now extends the scope of his reasoning. The two parts of Tusc. I, in spite of the contradictions between them, come from one and the same source. But the recognition of this fact makes the contradictions themselves all the more striking. Cic. himself obviously wished the two parts to be regarded as independent and treated them accordingly. The whole arrangement is his own. But he found the substance of his material in some one work of an earlier author, and sought only to abbreviate what he borrowed and to state it from points of view largely of his own selection. The work thus used by Cicero we may fairly assume to have been of a popular rather than of a strictly scientific character: taking subject and treatment together, we may refer it to the class of *λόγοι παραμυθητικοί* of which Krantor seems to have been the inventor. Such a conjecture is strongly confirmed by a comparison of Cic. Tusc. I with Plutarch Cons. ad Apollonium. The fact that both writers had drawn material from a common source was remarked long ago; but C. points out for the first time that passages confirming this view are to be found in the *first part* of Tusc. I. If the views stated in C.'s earlier dissertation are adopted, we need not inquire further after the author followed by Cicero and Plutarch. But it has been generally assumed that Plutarch followed Krantor directly. C. therefore proceeds to show that this view is untenable; that the work used, although it made use of Krantor's material, was composed after Krantor's death. The article is a fine specimen of the better sort of "Quellenuntersuchungen."

4. Pp. 524-75. E. Rohde. Studies in the Chronology of Greek literature. Continuation of the investigations touching the date of Homer, begun at p. 380.

5. Pp. 576-96. W. Deecke. Notes on the Interpretation of the Messapian Inscriptions. "Fassen wir die bisherigen Resultate zusammen, so kann das Messapische fast eine altgriechische, wenn man will pelasgische Sprache genannt werden, wie der altepirotische Zeus von Dodona bei Homer der 'pelasgische' heisst. Es giebt demgemäss vielfältige wichtige und interessante Aufschlüsse über die griechische Lautlehre, Flexion und Etymologie."

6. Pp. 597-603. C. Wachsmuth. 'Ο ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ ἀγών. The lines Ar. Ach. 502-507 have very little of the Aristophanic flavor. It is generally agreed that the piece is not free from interpolations. Definite objections to the lines in question are the following: 1. The connection of clauses in 504, indeed throughout the lines 504-506, is extremely awkward. 2. Unlike Aristophanes but very like an interpolator is the repetition of αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν (504), in ἀλλ' ἔσμεν αὐτοὶ (507). 3. ἐκ τῶν πόλεων οἱ ξύμμαχοι (506) is pleonastic. At that day in Athens αἱ πόλεις alone sufficed to designate the confederacy; a genuine way of saying what is here meant may be seen in 636. 5. The explanation given in 505-506 for the statement κοῦπω ξένοι πάρεσιν is simply silly. And finally, it is incredible that the poet—for this is his explanation with the audience—should have gone to work to make it so very clear to them that the present was not the time of year for the visit of the ambassadors—as if any Athenian had been stupid enough not to know that! In short, of what we have in 504-507, Aristophanes wrote only αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν νῦν γε περιεπτισμένοι. Having laid this foundation, W. goes on to show that ὁ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ ἀγών is not an Attic name for the competition which the interpolator meant to designate. We find τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Ληναίων, ἐν τοῖς Ληναϊκοῖς ἀγῶσι. But we do not find the ἀγῶνες nor the χοροὶ nor the διδασκαλῖαι nor the νῦκαι called ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ. This can only be used with propriety to mark the locality of the thing designated. In that sense we find the official name Διονύσια τὰ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ (from which the interpolator borrowed in fashioning his line), and ἡ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ πομπή. In our passage such a designation of the locality would have no sense, for at that period all the dramatic celebrations took place in the one Dionysiac theatre. In Plat. Protag. 327 D. ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ means nothing more than "in the theatre," the preceding πέρυσσι is quite enough to show that ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ is not used to distinguish one festival from another.

7. Pp. 604-40. Miscellany. F. Blass fills a dozen pages with notes on Greek inscriptions. These have to do mostly with the explanation of Boeotian and Doric forms, and do not admit of the compression necessary in these reports. A couple of remarks on Attic inscriptions may be reproduced. CIA. I 342 (CIG. I 27) concludes: Δήμητρος τε χάριω [καὶ] θυγατέρος [τ]ᾶν ἀνέπων. G. Meyer (Gr. Gr. §111) makes two mistakes worthy of correction. The form γένητε, which he cites as the earliest Attic example of ε for αι, is not to be found in the inscription in question (CIA. II 379, 18): the genuine reading is ὅπως γένητ' ἐφρόντισ[εν]. And αἱμάτιον for εἰμάτιον is nothing but a misprint copied out of Cauer. "Doch wäre es ungerecht, nicht anzuerkennen, dass die bei Cauer stehen gebliebenen Druckfehler weder seine zahlreichsten, noch seine unverzeihlichsten Sünden sind."

H. Heydemann continues the notes to inscriptions on Greek vases begun at p. 465.

F. Bücheler explains the inscriptions from Olympia, Nos. 382 and 383.

A. Ludwich writes Theocr. I 135-6: καὶ τῶς κύνας ὠλαφος ἔλκοι ἐξ ὀρέων, χοῖ σκῶπες ἀηδόσι δηρίσαντο, a correction which can hardly fail to find favor.

H. Flach examines the biographical notices in Suidas which show a use of the Greek translation of Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus* made by Sophronius.

S. Brandt offers six emendations to passages in Cicero's Letters to Atticus.

F. v. Duhn returns to the Harbor of Pompeii (see R. M. XXXV 127 ff.) Stricter investigation of the circumstances of the discovery of the articles found near the Molini de Rosa affords still clearer evidence that the mouth of the Sarnus and the docks of Pompeii were at that place. The space between the town and its harbor was occupied by a suburb.

J. Klein fills up the lacunae in a recently discovered Roman inscription containing the name of the *curator locorum publicorum* P. Catius Sabinus, and gives a list of such *curatores*, so far as known, from Augustus to Diocletian.

J. H. WHEELER.

ANGLIA. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. Bände V und VI, 1 u. 2 Hefte. Halle, 1882-83.

B. ten Brink begins volume V with brief remarks on the quantity of the first *e* in the O. E. (*i. e.* A. S.) suffix *-ere*, and concludes from O. E. verse, M. E. accent, and M. E. rime, that it is long.

G. Schleich furnishes some corrections to Varnhagen's text of the Proverbs of Hendyng, from the Cambridge and Oxford MSS, given in Anglia IV 180.

Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith prints, for the first time, the text of a ballad by Thomas Occleve, addressed to Sir John Oldcastle, A. D. 1415, from Phillipp MS 8151, with an introduction, giving some account of Oldcastle and Occleve, and notes. Occleve appeals to Oldcastle "to renounce his opinions as a follower of Wiclif, warning him of his errors and of his danger."

A. Fritzsche discusses the question: Is the O. E. [M. E.] story of Genesis and Exodus the work of one author? ten Brink, who first called attention to the source of this thirteenth century poem, namely, the *Historia Scholastica* of the French priest Petrus Comestor (1169-75), suggested the possibility of two authors. Fritzsche makes a careful study of the poem, based on Dr. Morris's edition for the E. E. T. Society, and concludes (p. 84), from the use of the same source in the same way, the same versification in respect to metre, rime and alliteration, and the same language in respect to phonology, grammar (referring to Morris and Hilmer), syntax and vocabulary, that there is but *one* author. He adds critical notes, agreeing in great part with Kölbing *Englische Studien*, III 273-334.

E. Eichenkel discusses the question: Is the late Anglo-Saxon [thirteenth century] legend of St. Katharine of Alexandria a work of the author of St. Juliana and St. Margaret, or of the author of Hali Meidenhad? This essay is the third part of the author's work, *Ueber die Verfasser einiger neuangels. Schriften*, Leipzig, 1881, in which he has shown that St. Juliana and St. Margaret are the work of the same author. He now compares the words and phrases, verse and style of St. Katharine with each of the above-mentioned works, and concludes that St. Katharine is *not* by the same author as the other two legends,

but that the latter writer knew and used the legend of St. Katharine. The second question is more difficult, but cannot be answered affirmatively; hence, the homily Hali Meidenhad is by a third hand and later than the others, or, at least, than St. Margaret.

A. Ebert, in the studies for his History of Mediaeval Literature, has compared the Anglo-Saxon Genesis with the Vulgate, and communicates the additions and omissions which he has noticed from v. 852 to end. He concludes that this part of the Genesis cannot be by Caedmon, for the writer evidently had the Bible *before his eyes*, which does not correspond with what Bede says about Caedmon, and, moreover, the *carmina* mentioned by Bede were lyrical poems, hymns, and so of a different kind from the Genesis.

K. J. Schröder suggests two very plausible emendations to the text of Marlowe's Faustus; the Latin words '*quod tumeraris*' should be '*quid tu moraris?*'; and '*ignei, aëri, aquitani spiritus*' should be '*ignis, aëris, aquae, terrae spiritus!*' Goethe's text confirms these.

A. Schröder prints the full text of John Bale's Comedy Concernynge Thre Lawes, Anno MDXXXVIII, preceded by an introduction giving a full account of Bale and his works, and followed by notes on certain words and an excursus on the metre. This miracle play has in the colophon "lately inprinted per Nicolaum Bamburgensem," of whom Schröder knows nothing, but thinks the play was printed in Germany. Only three copies remain, two in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, one of them incomplete, and one in the British Museum. Hazlitt mentions a second imprint at London, 1562, but no copy of this is in London or Oxford. So far as known, the play has not been printed since.

E. Einenkel, in his essay on An English Authoress of the beginning of the 12th [13th, Anz. 64] century, labors to prove that the Wohunge of ure Louerd, the Ureisun of God Almihti, and the Lofsong of ure Louerde, are written by women, *i. e.* nuns, and that it is not improbable that our authoress is identical with one of the three maidens of the Ancren Riwele. He thinks that he has proved the first position, and that a great deal may be said for the second. The investigation seems to proceed from this comprehensive premise (p. 265): "Das geschlecht des verfassers aller dieser liebeschriften ergibt sich deshalb ganz von selbst aus dem gegenstande desselben," *i. e.* if the work praises the Virgin Mary, it must be written by a man; if Christ, by a woman. Once granted, this would settle the question, but, notwithstanding the "liebeskultus," it may be doubted whether the monks resigned to the nuns the privilege of writing all Lofsonges of ure Louerde, and the Scotch verdict may apply to all such investigations.

D. Rohde writes an appreciative notice of W. Hertzberg, well known as an English scholar, and especially for his services to the study of Chaucer and Shakspeare. He died July 7, 1879. His life was marked by great literary activity. A complete list of his works closes the notice, which ends the first number of this volume.

A. Schröder opens the second number with a republication of the text of 'The Grave' from the MS (Bodl. 343), correcting some errors in Thorpe's text.

O. Lohmann contributes a critical essay on Byron's *Manfred* and its relation to poems of like contents, *i. e.* to the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, *Don Juan* of Molière, and *Faust* of Goethe. Goethe and Byron have transferred much of their own personality to the characters of their heroes; Molière and Aeschylus stand apart from their works. Shelley's *Prometheus* might have been advantageously included in the comparison.

M. Bech examines the Sources and Plan of the *Legende of Goode Women* and its relation to the 'Confessio Amantis.' The sources have already been noticed by ten Brink, Sandras, Bartsch, and Hertzberg, but in no case exhaustively. Besides the *Confessio Amantis*, Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum illustrium* and *De mulieribus claris liber* are taken into consideration. Lack of space forbids following the investigation, but after a full discussion of the Sources and a brief comparison with Gower, the general result in respect to the Plan is summed up, that, as the *Decamerone* was the model for the *Canterbury Tales*, so the *De mulieribus claris liber* was the model for the *Legende of Goode Women*, which, however, was never finished.

W. Sattler continues his Contributions on the use of Prepositions in Modern English, with XV, *to die of, to die from*; XVI, *the key of, the key to*; XVII, *kind of him, kind in him*; XVIII, *in a loud voice, with a (loud) voice*, forming a very full collection of examples.

A. Ebert on the *Exodus* (Anglo-Saxon), briefly states his reasons for regarding the so-called episode, 362-445, as an integral part of the poem and no interpolation, as recently treated in the Bonn dissertation of H. Balg on *The Poet Caedmon and his Works*.

K. A. M. Hartmann discusses the question: Is King Alfred the author of the alliterating version of the *Metres of Boethius*? He enumerates the opinions of scholars from Rawlinson (1698) down, showing that no one doubted the Alfredian authorship before Wright (1842), whose arguments are briefly stated, namely, that the writer omits to versify three metres, because they are not introduced by the usual formula in King Alfred's prose version; that the metres are very weak, considered from a poetical standpoint; and that the author has a very deficient knowledge of classical antiquity, and commits errors where Alfred's prose has the correct translation. Hartmann combats each of these arguments, defends the Alfredian authorship of the Preface, which ten Brink had questioned, though he favored the authenticity of the metres, adds arguments drawn from the use of certain expressions and particular words, and concludes that Wright's arguments are "pseudo-arguments," and that "King Alfred and nobody else is the author."

R. P. Wülcker, On the Vercelli-Book, states the results of his own examination of the MS, giving the beginning and the end of each of the homilies contained in it, the thirteenth complete, and extracts from the *Life of St. Guthlac* compared with Goodwin's text from Cotton MS, Vesp. D XXXI.

Wülcker prefixes an account of Blume's discovery, made in 1822, that the MS was written in Anglo-Saxon, the subsequent references to it, the first publication of the poetry by Thorpe, from a copy of the MS made by Blume, in Appendix B to Cooper's Report on Rymer's *Foedera*, made for the Record Commission (1836), Grimm's *Andreas and Elene* (1840), from Cooper, Kemble's

edition of the Poetry, with translation, for the Aelfric Society (1844-46), and Zupitza's edition of the Elene (1877) after a new collation made by Knöll. The Homilies of the Vercelli-Book have never been published.

T. Wissmann, in the last essay, On Middle-English Word-Accent, supports the views expressed in his King Horn against those of Schipper in his Old-English Metre. He examines the verse of the Ormulum and the Poema Morale, and argues that the 'senkungen' and the 'tonlose' and 'stumme silben' are treated in exact accordance with Lachmann's rules for M. H. G. metre, and in direct opposition to Schipper's view (p. 476). He further examines again certain verses in King Horn, and claims that they correspond to the rules heretofore laid down. He argues, too, against Vetter's view of Anglo-Saxon metre (supported by Schipper), and contends that by the acceptance of the 'zweihebungstheorie' all intelligible rhythm is lost and the absolute formlessness of Germanic metre is established (p. 481).

The controversy is continued in the Anzeiger by Einenkel, in a review of Schipper's work, by Schipper in reply, and by Trautmann. T. grants the 'zweihebungstheorie' for Anglo-Saxon verse, but his views on the metre of Layamon are similar to those of Wissmann on that of King Horn, and so are opposed to Schipper's. It would prolong this report to unreasonable length to go into the controversy, even to give an outline of these lengthy articles, but to an ordinary English ear, Schipper's view seems the more suitable to English verse. Wissmann's implied reproach to the 'zweihebungstheoretiker' [he inadvertently writes *vier*], namely, "Zwei gehobene silben in jeder halbzeile das ist so ziemlich das einzige [rather hauptsächlich] erfordermiss das sie an den rhythmus der [des] verses stellen" (p. 481), appears to be justified by the structure of Anglo-Saxon verse, and if so, historical consistency would lead us to expect it in the verse of Layamon and other Middle-English writers, and not to assume these works to be written on a different principle, however applicable that principle may be to Old and Middle High German verse. Also, there seems no good reason for assuming the final *e* in *lære* to be 'tonlos' but 'tonfähig,' while that of *spēke* is 'stumm,' and so 'tonunfähig,' according to Wissmann's terminology. The question here is not one of *quantity* of the root-syllable, but of *accent*, and so far from regarding "Schipper's versuch, die absolute tonunfähigkeit aller silben mit unbetontem *e* zu erweisen, als vollständig misglückt" (p. 476), I should take it as a simple statement of fact existing in English verse (cf. Schipper, section III, chapter 6, §§60-3).

Wissmann gives as Appendix a carefully prepared synopsis of the metre of eighteen M. E. works, illustrating the view which he is defending.

R. P. Wülcker contributes a short obituary notice of L. Botkine, the young French scholar, known from his translation of "Beowulf" and the Rune-Song, who died in May, 1832, at the early age of twenty-nine. We can sympathize with Wülcker's ejaculation: "Leider, wurde B. zu früh seiner wissenschaft entrisen und wer weiss wann wider jemand für verbreitung des Angelsächsischen in Frankreich wirken wird!" French students of Anglo-Saxon have been all too few, and may be counted on the fingers of one hand.

K. Elze adds an 'Entgegnung,' taking exception to certain remarks of Dr. Leo, in the Shakespeare Jahrbuch, which, however, seem quite complimentary.

It must suffice to add merely a summary of the contents of the *Anzeiger* to this volume. W. Muschacke reviews A. Brandl's *Thomas of Erceeldoune*; F. Dönne, G. Lüdtkke's *The Erl of Tolous and the Emperes of Almayn*; both of these works appear in the *Weidmannsche Sammlung englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben*. G. Tanger replies to Furnivall's remarks on his edition of the First and Second Quartos, and the First Folio of *Hamlet: Their Relation to Each Other*, reprinted from the New Shakspeare Society's *Transactions*, 1880-82; E. Einkenkel reviews O. Zielke's *Sir Orfeo, ein englisches Feenmärchen aus dem Mittelalter*; A. Brandl, R. H. Hutton's *Sir Walter Scott, in English Men of Letters Series*; M. Trautmann, C. Horstmann's *Altenglische Legenden*; Miss L. T. Smith, the *Catholicon Anglicum*, edited by S. J. Herrtage for the E. E. T. Society, 1881: this is an English-Latin word-book, dated 1483, and heretofore known in only two MSS; it contains about 8000 words, each provided by the editor with passages illustrative of its use; we find, *e. g.*, "*Loye: elegius, nomen proprium*," and notes to it, which, as Miss Smith remarks, settle the question as to the Prioress's oath.¹ (See A. J. P., II 386.) E. Einkenkel reviews at length (23 pages) Schipper's *Englische Metrik*, and later (*Anz.* 139) adds a continuation (5 pages) of this review; and M. Trautmann closes the first part of the *Anzeiger* with a review of D. Asher's pamphlet, *Ueber den Unterricht in den Neuern Sprachen, spezieller der Englischen, an unseren Universitäten und höheren Schulen*, and of G. Körting's *Gedanken und Bemerkungen über das Studium der Neuern Sprachen auf den Deutschen Hochschulen*, which review contains some valuable suggestions.

G. Schleich begins the second part with a review of *The Romaunce of the Sowdone of Babylone* and of *Ferumbras his Sone who conquerede Rome*, re-edited by E. Hausknecht for the E. E. T. Society, 1881; R. P. Wülcker reviews the *Toller-Bosworth Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, Parts I and II, and A. Napier's *Göttingen Inaugural-dissertation, Ueber die Werke des altenglischen erzbischofs Wulfstan*; R. Boyle, on A. H. Bullen's *Old Plays*, announces the completion of the reissue of *Day's Plays*, and asks for subscribers to four volumes of old dramas soon to be published by Mr. Bullen (*Vol. I* now ready), at one guinea per volume.

F. Kluge reviews Sievers's *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, the latest and best Anglo-Saxon grammar that we have; and W. Merkes, E. Einkenkel's work, *Ueber die Verfasser einiger neuangelsächsischer Schriften, i. e., St. Juliana, St. Margaret, and Hali Meidenhad*. (See above.)

Schipper, *Zur altenglischen Wortbetonung*, eine Entgegnung, follows, in which reply he sustains well his previously expressed views against his opponents, Wissmann in particular, rejecting *in toto* Lachmann's rules as inapplicable to English verse; Trautmann, *Zur alt- und mittenglischen Verslehre*, combats Schipper, but, while accepting Lachmann's *versregeln, i. e.*, adhering to the 'Vierhebungstheorie' for Layamon's verse, he rejects Lachmann's *betonungsgesetze*, and presents other rules of accent much more elastic, though still at variance with Schipper. He also takes exception to the measure assigned by Schipper to some other Middle-English poems. J. Koch reviews W. Eiler's

¹ On the deficiencies of Herrtage's ed. of the *Catholicon Anglicum*, see J. H. Hessels, in *Academy*, No. 586, for July 28, 1883.

Die Erzählung des Pfarrers in Chaucer's Canterbury-geschichten und die Somme de Vices et de Vertus des Frère Lorens, an Erlangen dissertation, and Zupitza's edition of Chaucer's Prolog. Einkenel completes his review of Schipper, and Trautmann finishes the Anzeiger, and the volume, with a notice of the Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der Germanischen Philologie, herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft für Deutsche Philologie in Berlin, dritter Jahrgang, 1881—a most useful work.

VI 1.

B. Leonhardt begins the sixth volume of the *ANGLIA* with an article on the Sources of Cymbeline. Besides the acknowledged sources of Shakspeare's play, namely, Holinshed's Chronicle and Boccaccio's Decameron II 9, the following have been regarded by some critics as sources of the play: 1. An English story, 'The Tale told by the Fishwife of Standon-the-Green' [? Stand-on], found in Westward for Smelts, a book published in 1619; 2. Two Old-French romances, belonging probably to the first half of the thirteenth century; 3. An Old-French miracle-play; and 4. The German tale of Sneewitchen, compared with Cymbeline by K. Schenkl in Germania IV. After a detailed examination of each of these the writer concludes that there is no reason for thinking that Shakspeare used any one of them, that Holinshed and Boccaccio were his only sources, the latter most probably in an English translation, although the earliest translation of the whole Decameron was not published until 1620,¹ and that the union of the two stories in the drama is entirely his own work.

P. Lange discusses Chaucer's Influence on Douglas. He compares at length Douglas's Palace of Honour with Chaucer's House of Fame and Prologue to the Legend of Good Women, and concludes that traces of this influence are plainly seen. Lange includes in his comparison some of the spurious poems, but, while this may show Douglas's acquaintance with these poems, it does not add any weight to the argument for Chaucer's influence. He notices also the sources of the Palace of Honour, and shows that the direct source is not the Tabula of Kebes, as thought by Warton, Irving, and Bishop Sage, the biographer of Douglas, but Le Séjour d'Honneur, by Octavien de St. Gelais, Bishop of Angoulême (1466–1502). Douglas's King Hart and Translation of Vergil are more briefly compared with Chaucer, and the conclusion drawn that in all his poems Douglas shows the influence of Chaucer.

E. Hausknecht contributes Old-English Glosses on the Brussels MS (No. 1650) of Aldhelm's De Laudibus Virginitatis. These have been already published by Mone (Quellen und Forschungen, 1830), and by Bouterwek (Haupt's Zeitschrift IX), but with some errors in both publications.

J. Koch supplies Chauceriana. I. 'Mother of God,' to the authorship of which he thinks Occleve has greater claims than Chaucer; and II. Canterbury Tales, Prologue 459–60, quoting a passage from Jobi Ludolfi alias Leutholf dicti ad suam Historiam Aethiopicam Commentarius (Frankfort, 1691): 'De

¹ Perry, English Literature in the Eighteenth Century, p. 287, note, states that "many of his stories—Bandello's and Cinthio's—had been translated in William Paynter's 'Palace of Pleasure' (1566)."

copulatione conjugum ante fores templi,' etc., which throws light upon the Wife of Bath's statement, 'Housbondes atte chirch dore I have had fyve.'

E. Uhlemann compares Chaucer's House of Fame and Pope's Temple of Fame, that is, those parts of the third book of Chaucer's poem which Pope has professedly followed. Uhlemann finds that Pope has completely changed many parts of his model, having taken only the leading thoughts from Chaucer's poem, and having worked the descriptive details to correspond to the taste of his time; also, that Pope's style and metre differ greatly from Chaucer's. He thus confirms, in general, Pope's own statement of his indebtedness to Chaucer, but agrees rather with Warton than with Steele in his estimate of the poem; the latter says: "the original vision of Chaucer was never denied to be much improved"; the former, "He (Pope) has not only misrepresented the story, but marred the character of the poem."

A. Leicht, in reply to Hartmann (Anglia V 411), discusses the question: Is King Alfred the author of the alliterating metres of Boethius? He finds that this is but an indifferent paraphrase of King Alfred's prose version, padded out with stereotype poetical expressions drawn from the ancient epic poetry and inserted in a tasteless manner, and that the writer has occasionally misunderstood his prose model, especially two passages in Metre 26, IV 3, in one of which the prose version speaks of Ulysses as King of Ithaca (*Iþacige*), and for this the poetical version substitutes *Þracia*. Moreover, this version is pervaded not by a poetical, but by a pedantic spirit, and does not observe the laws of alliteration as seen in the older poetry. Therefore also, Alfred is not the author of the preface and introduction, but these are written by the poetical paraphrast, most probably a monk who desired to shield his unskilful work under Alfred's great name. Leicht thus controverts the view of Rawlinson, Cardale, Fox, Tupper [!], and even ten Brink, and agrees with Wright, who (as stated above) first attacked the Alfredian authorship of the alliterating metres, though he takes exception to some of Wright's arguments. It is some consolation to have King Alfred relieved of the reputation of being a bad poet. Leicht will have another article in a future number on the prose Preface and the relation of the prose version to the Latin.

J. Platt contributes *Angelsaechsisches*, as follows: 1. A. S. genders, a list of words of different genders in older and later works. 2. Local names of the *bōc*-declension, *Cent*, *Cert*, *I'*, *Tenet*, *Wiht*. 3. A true A. S. dual, *i. e. sculdru* [?]. 4. A. S. *u* in feminine of the *n*-declension. 5. A. S. feminine *wā*-stems, *mdeð*, *ldeð*. 6. A. S. *fetian*, *feccan*. 7. A. S. feminine termination *-icge*. Some of Mr. Platt's statements, especially under 2 and 3, might provoke discussion, and with regard to his assertion under 6: "So sprechen wir im engl. *Tuesday* nicht *tjūs* sondern *chūs* aus," I have only to say that, if this is the prevalent "London" pronunciation, it is but another proof that the correct pronunciation of English is better preserved on this side of the water.

C. Weiser furnishes an unpublished letter of Shelley's, of Nov. 22, 1817, sent him by Mr. R. Garnett, the editor of Shelley's letters. It is of interest only as showing Shelley's opinion of his "Queen Mab," and his professed determination to devote his life to inculcating "the doctrine of equality and liberty and disinterestedness, and entire unbelief in religion of any sort." The

letter was found in the library of Lord Lytton, and was sent to Weiser because he had published a translation of "Queen Mab."

2.—The *Anzeiger* to ANGLIA VI opens with a long review by W. Schumann of Dr. Morris's *Genesis and Exodus*, A. D. 1250 (E. E. T. Society, 1874). After some remarks on Morris's Introduction, with references also to Fritzsche's article in *Anglia* V 43, and to Hilmer's *Gymnasialprogramm* (Sondershausen, 1876), Schumann gives nearly thirty pages of notes, both critical and explanatory, on about 150 passages of the poem. Lack of space will not permit a summary of these reviews and book-notices, but a mere enumeration must suffice. L. Morsbach reviews Thum's *Anmerkungen zu Macaulay's History of England*, and Hoppe's edition of Dickens's *Cricket on the Hearth*; H. Löschhorn, J. Koch's *Siebenschläfer Legende, ihr Ursprung und ihre Verbreitung*; F. H. Stratmann, Kölbings *Sir Tristrem*; E. Peters, Holder's *Baeda*, in his *Germanischer Bücherschatz*. Here is *Baeda's* complete history for 4.50 marks; the reviewer congratulates the public on this fact. While mentioning the English editions of Stevenson and Giles, he omits those of Moberly and Lumby. J. Koch excoriates Wihlidal's Chaucer's 'Knights Tale,' calling it "Ein in jeder beziehung elendes machwerk," and his notice abundantly substantiates this criticism. R. Wülcker reviews Mentzel's *Geschichte der Schauspielkunst* in Frankfurt am Main; J. Koch, *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!* by Quousque Tandem, in which some ideas are presented that deserve attention in America, as well as in Germany; E. Peters, Wagner's *Visio Tnugdali. lateinisch und altddeutsch*. E. Eienkel adds an Erklärung gegen Schipper, still holding to his previously expressed views, but very unnecessarily reflecting upon a writer in 'The Nation' of Oct. 12, 1882 (No. 902), who supports Schipper's views. I cannot notice this controversy further. (See above.) M. Trautmann notices, with highly appreciative comments, Professor Child's new edition of *English and Scottish Ballads*, Part I, and gives a synopsis of the contents of its 28 pieces. L. Morsbach briefly dispatches Hierthes, *Wörterbuch des schottischen Dialekts in den werken von Walter Scott und Burns*, as "das stümperhafte machwerk," and says that it may be recommended to students only "damit sie frühe lernen, wie man es *nicht* machen solle." R. Wülcker closes this number of the *Anzeiger* with a notice of Furnivall's edition of the *Digby Mysteries* (New Shakspeare Society, 1882), containing three Mysteries now published for the first time, though fifty copies of the Digby MS were once printed by the Abbotsford Club.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

HERMES, 1882.

No. III.

Wilamowitz, of Greifswald, A paper on the *Heraclidae* of Euripides. The most important of the four chapters in this paper is the first one. W. argues that there are imperfections in the extant drama so gross as to compel the critic to infer not merely that the piece is transmitted to us in bad shape, but that we have not before us the original Euripidean composition at all, and that we now read the play as recast by a later playwright of the histrionic profession.

Wilamowitz's criticism in this part of the discussion consists mainly in considerations bearing upon dramatic propriety.

Macaria, in order to insure victory for the hospitable arms of protecting Athens (in accordance with the condition of the oracle), announces her intention of sacrificing herself. She departs with the words, 595 (Kirchhoff)

. . . τὸ γὰρ θανεῖν
κακὸν μέγιστον φάρμακον νομίζεται.

One would expect to hear a report of her end from some ἀγγελος, with a monody of lamentation from the lips of her grandmother Alcmena, but we are met by an utter absence of these essential stages in the development of the action. W. argues earnestly and ingeniously against the assumption of a mere lacuna in the text. W. finds in Eurip. fragm. 848, ὅστις δὲ τοὺς τεκόντας ἐν βίῳ σέβει κτέ the conclusion of the missing report of Macaria's death, assigns a place in the original drama to the three verses now classed as fragm. 219 (Antiope), and condemns the present parodos of the Heraclidae. This recasting of the play he assumes to have been made by a stage manager of the fourth century B. C., a man not actuated by literary vanity so much as by practical regard for stage uses.¹

O. Rossbach, De Senecae Dialogis. How far do the extant works of Seneca admit that title? Quintilian X 1, 128 quotes *dialogi*. Generally editors have been rating Seneca's *dialogi* as *libri deperditi*, but Rossbach, from a special inspection of the Milan MS of S., infers that the word *dialogi* really refers to a number of extant writings of Seneca. Of course the word *dialogus* must be taken not in the Platonic sense, but rather in the same way in which it applies to the discursive treatises, rhetorical and philosophical, of Cicero, opposing views being brought forward and combated, although represented by no definite character or personality. Interesting remarks are subjoined on the estimate put upon Seneca's books in subsequent times.

Diels,² Stichometrisches. D. takes exception to some views advanced by Th. Birt ("Ueber das antike Buchwesen"), and basing his own theory on a passage in Galen (V 655 Kühn, 656, 6, Müller) comes to the following conclusion: The ancient normal stichos, while substantially representing the bulk of an heroic hexameter, was based not on the counting of letters, but of syllables, the latter averaging sixteen in number.

I. Vahlen, Varia. We have noted in former reports that in textual criticism this eminent scholar pursues a conservative tendency. How much his influence

¹ Some of W.'s statements are far too positive, p. 341: Wie das Stück vorliegt, ist die verwunderte Frage des Iolaos ob denn die Entscheidung so nahe sei, *nothwendig*. . . . Aber die Entscheidung ist hier minder leicht und sicher, weil so ziemlich die ganze Scene 630-60 dem Bearbeiter zufallen *mus*s. It may be worth while to compare the following sentences of W.'s with the lines of Euripides: "In der That bin ich froh dass Euripides an den Geschmacklosigkeiten dieser Verse unschuldig ist. Iolaos ruft die Alcmena nicht lauter heraus als nöthig ist, damit sie ihn hört, ja wie es scheint nicht laut genug, denn die Begründung seines Rufes (644-5) hat sie offenbar überhört. Sie poltert nämlich heraus, behauptet der ganze Tempel wäre voll Geschrei gewesen, herrscht den unschuldigen Knappen an, im Glauben er wäre Kopreus, und droht ihm mit Thätlichkeiten." But is it not intrinsically probable that Alcmena, in her despondency and gloom, is prepared in advance for no message but one demanding extradition, for no news but bad news, for no messenger but one from Argos? The text really does not suggest her believing that she beholds Kopreus himself, for she says, 647:

Ἰόλαε, μὲν τις σ' αὖ βιάζεται
κῆρυξ ἀπ' Ἀργεῶν.

E. G. S.

² Compare Amer. Journ. of Philol. 1882, p. 108.

will prevail against the long-established bias of many German scholars towards reckless *ἀθέτησις*, time will show. Suffice it to say here that the ample learning, the circumspect use of analogy, the employment of sound methods of criticism, make the papers of Vahlen very instructive indeed. In the first note he proves, against Ritschl and Lachmann, that *et* in Plautus and in Lucretius *does* occur in the sense of *etiam*. In the second discussion (on Plato Phaedr. 236 *b*), he maintains the MS reading *στάθητι* against Cobet and Schanz. Also in the passage a little below (236 *c*), *ῥητέον μὲν γὰρ σοι παντὸς μᾶλλον κτέ*, he shows that the MS reading, with proper pointing, makes better sense and grammar than the text as changed by Cobet and Schanz.

Th. Mordtmann (Pera) attacks the authenticity of a number of inscriptions and MSS which Francois Lenormant has been publishing within the last twenty years. This is followed by H. Roehl (Berlin), in *Franciscum Lenormant Inscriptionum Falsarium*, in which Lenormant is called to account for a long string of forgeries. Among the scholars who condemn Lenormant's unsupported statements are mentioned Kirchhoff, Kumanudis, Koehler, Kaibel, Dittenberger. Near the end of his paper Roehl says: *Dicet quispiam, petendum esse a Lenormanto ut duos catalogos antiquitatum a se editarum publici iuris faciat, alterum genuinarum, alterum fictarum. Nos hoc non petimus; quis enim fidem ei habiturus esset?*

C. Robert. König Philipp V und die Larisaer. Robert reprints with slight critical alterations an inscription of Larisa, Thessaly, discovered by H. G. Lolling. This inscription is a record of a certain transaction of the commonwealth of Larisa. The time is probably the earlier years of the Hannibalian epoch. King Philip (father of Perseus), last but one of the Macedonian dynasty, strongly urges Larisa to adopt into full citizenship their metics (*i. e.* those of Greek nationality), so as to strengthen both Larisa itself as well as the royal interest. This matter the king urged in two letters, the first of which (according to Mommsen's appended commentary) was written in 220 B. C., the second in 214. Both of these letters are incorporated in the record together with the decree asked for, as well as lists of those who consequently received the franchise. This inscription enables us to realize more vividly than could be done before the political situation as regards Rome and Greece in that age. The inscription on the grammatical side affords the student ample illustration of Thessalian phonetics and inflection, being of near kin to the Aeolian dialect of Lesbos, etc. A few specimens may here be given: *κίς* = *τίς*; *διέ κί* = *διὰ τί*; *ποχ κί* = *πρὸς τί*; *ἔμμεν* = *εἶναι*; *καθίμεν* = *κατθῆναι*; *ἀπύ* = *ἀπό*; *ὄνομα* = *ὄνομα*, Attic *ω* is invariably represented by *ου*: *e. g.* *Φεῖδουν, Κίμουν, τοῦν ἄλλον* *Ἑλλάνουν*, . . . *τοῦν χρεισίμουν (χρησίμων)*; *ποτεδέετο* = *προσεδεῖτο*; *τοῖ βασιλεῖος* = *τοῦ βασιλέως*; *ἐσγόνιος* = *ἐκγόνιος*; *ἐσδόμεν* = *ἐκδοῦναι*; *ὀγγράφαντας* = *ἀναγράφαντας*. Literature probably was but little practiced amongst the Thessalian lairds (unless by hiring alien celebrities), and the consequent wearing away of inflection and the tendency towards apocope and assimilation are evident in the present inscription: *ποκ κί, ποτ τὸς ταγός, κατ τὰν ἐπιστολάν. ἐν* takes the accus. (= *εἰς c. acc.*) *e. g.* *καθίμεν τὰμ μὲν ἱαν ἐν τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπλουνος*.

Kühlewein (Ilfeld) gives some specimens of a Latin version of Hippocrates' Aphorisms found in Codex 97 at Monte Cassino. This copy (it is evidently a

copy of the original translation), K. assumes to have been made in the tenth century A. D., and its critical value he esteems greatly.

C. De Boor (Berlin) discusses the historian Trajanus. He suggests that Suidas' article on Τραιανὸς πατρίκιος is the result of a *contaminatio* of two distinct persons, both of the Eastern Empire, of whom one flourished about 700 A. D., while the other held high office under the Emperor Valens, and was killed at Hadrianople, 378 A. D.

No. IV.

Th. Kock, of Berlin, presents a commentary on Horace, Carm. I 12:

Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri
tibia sumis celebrare, Clío? etc.

Very many critics have rejected stanzas 10-11, vss. 37-44,

Regulum et Scauros . . . cum lae fundus.

In explaining his dissent from this tradition in criticism, Kock takes decided exception to Haupt's view that for the first generation or two the Odes were handed down in a "Schulexemplar," and thus many interpolations were due to imitative verse writing in schools.¹ Nor is Kock prepared to reject the *testimonium* contained in Quintil. IX 3, 18, as being itself an interpolation. The fact is, critics have frequently approved of, or rejected, details in accordance with their theory of the general structure and theme of the entire ode. Now, while such construction can but rarely claim universal assent, Kock is willing to turn this same standard of criticism to conservative purposes. His view of the succession of topics is *dei*; (*ἥρωες*) *heroes* (= demigods); *viri* (= heroes); and the survey of group 2 he considers concluded with *Catonis nobile letum*. Topic 3 Kock's argues begins with *Regulam et Scauros* and is brought down to the contemporary *Marcelli* and *Julii*, the union of which as planned by the domestic and dynastic policy of his patron Augustus, the poet proposes to glorify in the present ode.

O. Rossbach prints a number of critical notes on the *Ilias Latina* of Silius Italicus. Rossbach claims that Italicus allowed himself considerable latitude in his version, and that many strictures of critics are disposed of when one realizes that fact.

Th. Mommsen, *Die Inschrift von Hissarlik und die Römische Sammherrschaft in ihrem titularen Ausdrucke*. This paper discusses the same inscription of Rumania discussed in *Hermes*, 1882, No. 2, by Gardthausen (see A. J. P., Vol. IV, p. 110). Mommsen comes to the conclusion that the inscription is not one of Constantine II, but of Valens, the coregent (Augustus) of Valentinianus, fl. 370 A. D. Mommsen uses the inscription to enlarge upon the formulae of joint address in official language addressed to Augusti, as distinguished from the mere plural of respect.

Emil Thomas prints ten critical notes, chiefly on the Aristotelian *Magna Moralia*, largely constructed in imitation of the *Nicom. Ethics*. Many of the

¹ Cf. also Lucian Müller's *Praefatio* to his Horace, Teubner, 1871, p. ix: Ceterum quod omnes probabilitatis numeros implet proximis post Flaccum annis LX irrepsisse quidquid in libris eius latet versuum spuriorum, etiam metricis rationibus comprobatur.

corruptions and other critical difficulties are easily removed by inspecting the original passages in the Nicom. Ethics.

E. Fabricius, Die Skeuothek des Philon. This important inscription on the famous naval arsenal at Zea in the Piræus has been edited and translated in this Journal by Th. W. Ludlow, Amer. Journ. of Philol. III, pp. 317-28.

I. Vahlen, *Varia*, continues his suggestive critical notes, chiefly on passages in Plautus, and mainly in defense of the MS reading, or, if not, at least so as to disapprove of the critical suggestions of Schoell, Goetz and Loewe. His notes in great part are replies to Schoell (although he now refrains from mentioning the latter by name). As to solid learning, Vahlen's notes on *licentia collocandi* in Plautus (p. 612 sqq.) are particularly valuable. It may be interesting to let Vahlen tell in his own way how he would edit a critical edition for university purposes (p. 610 sqq.): "In Menaechmis igitur, quam fabulam nuper auditorum meorum in usum exprimendam curavi, hoc egi potissimum, ut poetae verba legerentur qualia librorum memoria sedulo consulta nec correctionibus adhibitibus nisi certis cum fiducia quadam veri exhiberi posse viderentur. Et hoc quod summum erat, universe me satis recte assecutum adhuc confido. Levidensem hanc operam visam esse nulliusque rem iudicii haberi, si qui non occaecatus opinionum multitudine ac varietate nihil nisi quod cum fide poni possit sibi sequendum duxerit, id quid miri hac aetate, qua non modio neque trimodio, verum ipso horreo funduntur emendationes Plautinae, neque pretium editionibus nisi ex novarum coniecturarum numero dici solet. . . . In adnotatione quam subieci nolui aliorum exempla imitatus aut codicum apices cum pulvisculo exhaurire, quae res praesertim alibi parata esset, nec commentorum immensam molem exaedificare, sed id cavens ad iudicandam textus fidem quem edebam, quod utile esset ne desideraretur, ad eam normam addenda et omittenda secrevi."

Kirchhoff, Eine Attische Todtenliste. Of this table K. publishes a very handsome facsimile, being an excellent illustration of the Attic alphabet in the generation preceding the archonship of Euclides. The dead of this catalogue are Attic citizens slain ἐν Χερρονήσῳ Ἐμ Βυζαντίῳ and ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις πόλε-μοις. The citizens are given by tribes, the Acamantis alone not occurring. Eleutheræ is given separately, a community not ranged under any of the ten tribes at that time. Kirchhoff differs from Kumanudis in putting the inscription considerably later in the V century than the former; he assigns it to 408 B. C., and interprets the data to fit the Hellespontian and Byzantian operations of Alcibiades in 409 B. C. In this inscription ξ is expressed by χς. A pair of elegiac distichs is appended in which the reader will recognize the phonetic spelling of the stonecutter:

Οἶδε παρ' Ἑλλήσποντον ἀπώλεσαν ἄγλαον ἥβην
 βαρνάμενοι σφετέραν δ' ἐκλείσαμπατρίδα,
 ὥστ' ἐχθροὺς στενάχειμπολέμον θέρος ἐκκομίσαντας·
 αὐτοῖς δ' ἀθάνατον μνήμ' ἀρετῆς ἔθεσαν.

Th. Mommsen, Das Augustische Festverzeichniss von Cumæ. Mr. Stevens in the course of his excavations has come upon the last of three fragments of this inscription, the former two having been discovered by Guarini, 1834, and by Mommsen, 1846, so that now the inscription may be read entire.

This interesting document proves that *municipia*, in the matter of domestic celebration, made their own decrees independently of the Roman Senate. Thus, under date of Sept. 23, there is "Immolatio Caesari hostia" (â), whereas at the capital, divine honors were officially paid to Augustus only after his death. We notice, too, that the municipium of Cumae had no official annual celebration of Actium, whereas the accession of Lepidus' army to the standards of Octavianus is set down for Sep. 3. The historical value of the inscription is so considerable that the readers of the Journal will be glad to possess it entire.

Aug. 19. [XIIII K. Septembr. Eo die Caesar pri]mum consulatum in[iit. Supplicatio] . . .

Sept. 3. [III Non. Septembr. Eo die exer]citus Lepidi tradidit se Caesari. Suppli[c]a[tio] . . .

Sept. 23. [VIII K. Octobr. N]atalis Caesaris. Immolatio Caesari hostia; supplicatio [sic] . . .

Oct. 5. Nonis Octobr. Drusi Caesaris natalis. Supplicatio Vestae.

Oct. 18. XV K. Novimbr. Eo die Caesar togam virilem sumpsit. Supplicatio Spei et Iuve[ntuti] . . .

Nov. 16. XVI K. Dicimbr. Natalis Ti. Caesaris. Supplicatio Vestae.

Dec. 15. XVIII K. Januar. Eo die a[r]a Fortunae reducis dedicatast, quae Caesarem A[ugustum ex transmari]nis provinciis red[uxit]. Supplicatio Fortunae reduci.

Jan. 7. VII idus Januar. E[o die Caesar] primum fasces sumpsit. Supplicatio [sic] Iovi[sempi]t[erno].

Jan. 16. [XV]III [sic] K. Febr. Eo di[e Caesar Augustu]s appellatus est. Supplicatio Au[gusto].

Jan. 30. [III K. Febr. Eo die ara Pacis Aug. dedicata] est. Supplicatio impe[r]io Caesaris Augusti cust[odis] [civium Romanorum orbisque terrar]um.

Mart. 6. [pridie Non. Mart. Eo die Caesar pontifex ma]ximus creatus est. Supplicatio [sic] Vestae, dis pub[licis] P[enatibus] p[opuli] R[oman]. Q[uiritium].

Apr. 14. [XVIII Kal. Mai. Eo die Caesar primum vicit. Suppli]catio Vi[ctoriae] Augustae.

Apr. 15. [XVII Kal. Mai. Eo die Caesar primum imperator app]ellatus est. Supplicatio Félicitati imperi.

Mai. 12. [IIII id. Mai. Eo die aedes Martis dedicatest. Supplica]tio Mólibus Mártis.

Mai. 24. [VIII K. Jun. Germanici Caesaris natalis. Supp]licatio Vestae.

Jul. 12. [IIII id. Jul. Natalis divi Juli. Supplicatio Iov]i, Marti ultori, Veneri [genetrici] . . . [Suppli]catio Iovi.

E. G. SIHLER.